

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, the drawing has been replaced. The Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 11-19 and 24-27 and objected to claims 9-10 and 20-23. The Examiner's rejections and objections are traversed below. Claims 1-29 are pending and under consideration.

OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS:

At page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p) (5) because include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: "206" recited in FIG. 3 is not mentioned in the specification.

The "206" of in FIG. 3 has been deleted. In view of the above amendment, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider the objection.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

In the Office Action at pages 2-3, the Examiner rejects claims 1-3 and 12-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of Mariyama (US Patent No. 4,349,715). This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The Examiner asserts that Mariyama discloses a cassette tape controlled microwave cooking apparatus comprising an audio player 14; a body 11 with a player seat to which the audio player 18 is attached and from which the audio player 18 is detached; and at least one speaker 24 to output sound signals reproduced by the audio player 18. As mentioned above, claim 1 is directed to "an audio player is attached and from which the audio player is detached a body (microwave oven)." However, the Examiner misunderstands a cassette tape inlet 14 and control panel 11 in Mariyama as an audio player and a body recited in claim 1, respectively. Moreover, Mariyama fails to disclose "a body with a player seat to which the audio player is attached and from which the audio player is detached" recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited art and is submitted to be allowable. Claims 2-3 and 12, which depend from claim 1, are also submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, as well as for the additional recitations therein. Furthermore, claim 13 is also submitted to be allowable for at least the similar reasons as set

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

In the Office Action at item 2, the Examiner objected to the drawings. In order to overcome these objections, replacement figures are submitted herewith. In FIG. 3, label 206 has been deleted. Approval of these changes to the Drawings is respectfully requested.

forth in claim 1, as well as for the additional recitations therein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

In the Office Action, at pages 3-4, the Examiner rejects claims 4-5, 14-15 and 25-26 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Mariyama (US Patent No. 4,349,715) in view of Jonic (US Patent No. 5,506,563).

Claims 4-5, 14-15, and 25-26 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

In the Office Action, at page 4, item 7, the Examiner rejects claims 6-8 and 16-18 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Mariyama (US Patent No. 4,349,715) in view of Murayama (US Patent No. 4,630,160). This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The Examiner asserts that Murayama discloses lock means instead of an eject button. It is noted that the function of the locking means is to lock things and does not need to have a function of ejecting. Thus, the locking means is not interchangeable with ejecting button. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Mariyama and Murayama does not disclose or suggest the features as recited in claim 6.

In addition, as the Office Action appears to base the rejection of claims 7-8 and 16-18 on similar rationale as claim 6, it is respectfully requested the rejection of independent claims 7 - 8 and 16-18 also be withdrawn.

Claims 11, 19 and 27 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Mariyama (US Patent No. 4,349,715) in view of Schotz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,946,343).

At page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Schotz et al. discloses wireless transmitting/receiving units respectively in both the audio player and the body. As mentioned above, Mariyama fails to disclose "a body with a player seat to which the audio player is attached and from which the audio player is detached. Furthermore, it is noted that the Examiner misunderstands a receiver (24) in Schotz et al. (col. 6, lines 10-27) as the body. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Mariyama and Schotz et al. does not disclose or suggest the invention recited in claim 11. Therefore, for at least the above, it is respectfully requested that this rejection of independent claim 11 be withdrawn and allowed, in addition, for at least similar rationale, it is respectfully submitted that claim 19 is also in proper condition for allowance. It is noted that features from canceled claim 25 has been incorporated into

independent claim 27, and claim 27 has been amended into independent form. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 27 is in proper condition for allowance.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Mariyama (US Patent No. 4,349,715) in view of Maeda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5, 981, 929).

The Examiner asserts that Mariyama discloses all of the claimed structure as recited in claim 24 except the microwave oven and Maeda et al. discloses a range hood. As mentioned above, Mariyama fails to disclose "a body with a player seat to which the audio player is attached and from which the audio player is detached. Although Maeda et al. discloses "a range hood", this reference is not cited for and does not cure the above noted deficiencies of Mariyama. Therefore it is respectfully submitted that neither Mariyama nor Maeda et al., either alone or in combination, teach or suggest the features recited in claim 24.

OBJECTION OF CLAIMS 9 – 10 AND 20 - 23:

Claims 9–10 and 20–23 are objected to being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, reconsideration of claims 9-10 and 20-23 is respectfully requested based upon the reasons mentioned above.

STATUS OF ALLOWED CLAIMS:

Claims 28 and 29 have been allowed.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 9/17/04

By: 

Michael D. Stein
Registration No. 37,240

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

ANNOTATED SHEET }



FIG. 3

